



JOHN CHIANG
California State Controller

July 22, 2013

Chris Yatooma, Vice President of Administration
Sierra Joint Community College District
5000 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, CA 95677

Dear Mr. Yatooma:

The State Controller's Office reviewed the costs claimed by the Sierra Joint Community College District for the legislatively mandated Integrated Waste Management Program (Chapter 1116, Statutes of 1992; and Chapter 764, Statutes of 1999) for the period of July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2001; and July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2010. Our review was limited to ensuring that offsetting savings were properly reported in accordance with program requirements.

The district claimed \$238,419 for the mandated program. Our review found that \$98,784 is allowable and \$139,635 is unallowable. The costs are unallowable because the district did not report any offsetting savings realized as a result of implementing its integrated waste management plan, as described in the attached Summary of Program Costs, Summary of Offsetting Savings Calculations, and the Finding and Recommendation.

For the fiscal year (FY) 1999-00 through FY 2000-01, and FY 2003-04 through FY 2009-10 claims, the State made no payment to the district. Our review found that \$98,784 is allowable. The State will pay that amount, contingent upon available appropriations.

If you disagree with the review finding, you may file an Incorrect Reduction Claim (IRC) with the Commission on State Mandates (CSM). The IRC must be filed within three years following the date that we notify you of a claim reduction. You may obtain IRC information at the CSM's website at www.csm.ca.gov/docs/IRCForm.pdf.

If you have any questions, please contact Jim L. Spano, Chief, Mandated Cost Audits Bureau, at (916) 323-5849.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

JEFFREY V. BROWNFIELD, CPA
Chief, Division of Audits

JVB/kw

Attachments

RE: S13-MCC-942

MAILING ADDRESS P.O. Box 942850, Sacramento, CA 94250-5874
SACRAMENTO 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816 (916) 324-8907
LOS ANGELES 901 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 200, Monterey Park, CA 91754-7619 (323) 981-6802

Chris Yatooma,
Vice President of Administration

-2-

July 22, 2013

cc: Colin Irwin, Deputy Director of Plant Operations
Sierra Joint Community College District
Kerri Hester, Director of Finance
Sierra Joint Community College District
Linda Fisher, Finance Manager
Sierra Joint Community College District
Christine Atalig, Specialist, College Finance and Facilities Planning
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Mollie Quasebarth, Principal Program Budget Analyst
Education Systems Unit, California Department of Finance
Mario Rodriguez, Finance Budget Analyst
Education Systems Unit, California Department of Finance
Jay Lal, Manager
Division of Accounting and Reporting
State Controller's Office

**Attachment 1—
Summary of Program Costs
July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2001;
and July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2010**

Cost Elements	Actual Costs Claimed	Allowable per Review	Review Adjustment ¹
<u>July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2000</u>			
Direct costs:			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 14,738	\$ 14,738	\$ —
Materials and supplies	2,259	2,259	—
Total direct costs	16,997	16,997	—
Indirect costs	6,197	6,197	—
Total direct and indirect costs	23,194	23,194	—
Less offsetting savings ²	—	(3,981)	(3,981)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 23,194</u>	19,213	<u>\$ (3,981)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 19,213</u>	
<u>July 1, 2000, through June 30, 2001</u>			
Direct costs:			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 17,330	\$ 17,330	\$ —
Materials and supplies	1,743	1,743	—
Total direct costs	19,073	19,073	—
Indirect costs	7,165	7,165	—
Total direct and indirect costs	26,238	26,238	—
Less offsetting savings ²	—	(7,250)	(7,250)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 26,238</u>	18,988	<u>\$ (7,250)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 18,988</u>	
<u>July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004</u>			
Direct costs:			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 16,342	\$ 16,342	\$ —
Materials and supplies	2,239	2,239	—
Total direct costs	18,581	18,581	—
Indirect costs	6,276	6,276	—
Total direct and indirect costs	24,857	24,857	—
Less offsetting savings ²	—	(17,095)	(17,095)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 24,857</u>	7,762	<u>\$ (17,095)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 7,762</u>	

Attachment 1 (continued)

Cost Elements	Actual Costs Claimed	Allowable per Review	Review Adjustment ¹
<u>July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005</u>			
Direct costs:			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 18,552	\$ 18,552	\$ —
Materials and supplies	1,986	1,986	—
Total direct costs	20,538	20,538	—
Indirect costs	7,587	7,587	—
Total direct and indirect costs	28,125	28,125	—
Less offsetting savings ²	—	(19,634)	(19,634)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 28,125</u>	8,491	<u>\$ (19,634)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 8,491</u>	
<u>July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006</u>			
Direct costs:			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 27,227	\$ 27,227	\$ —
Total direct costs	27,227	27,227	—
Indirect costs	9,721	9,721	—
Total direct and indirect costs	36,948	36,948	—
Less offsetting savings ²	—	(22,011)	(22,011)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 36,948</u>	14,937	<u>\$ (22,011)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 14,937</u>	
<u>July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007</u>			
Direct costs:			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 20,995	\$ 20,995	\$ —
Materials and supplies	24,050	24,050	—
Total direct costs	45,045	45,045	—
Indirect costs	8,080	8,080	—
Total direct and indirect costs	53,125	53,125	—
Less offsetting savings ²	—	(23,732)	(23,732)
Total program costs	<u>\$ 53,125</u>	29,393	<u>\$ (23,732)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 29,393</u>	

Attachment 1 (continued)

Cost Elements	Actual Costs Claimed	Allowable per Review	Review Adjustment ¹
<u>July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008</u>			
Direct costs:			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 14,067	\$ 14,067	\$ —
Total direct costs	14,067	14,067	—
Indirect costs	5,321	5,321	—
Total direct and indirect costs	19,388	19,388	—
Less offsetting savings ²	—	(24,282)	(24,282)
Subtotal	19,388	(4,894)	(24,282)
Adjustment to eliminate negative balance	—	4,894	4,894
Total program costs	<u>\$ 19,388</u>	—	<u>\$ (19,388)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ —</u>	
<u>July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009</u>			
Direct costs:			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 10,219	\$ 10,219	\$ —
Total direct costs	10,219	10,219	—
Indirect costs	4,827	4,827	—
Total direct and indirect costs	15,046	15,046	—
Less offsetting savings ²	—	(25,999)	(25,999)
Subtotal	15,046	(10,953)	(25,999)
Adjustment to eliminate negative balance	—	10,953	10,953
Total program costs	<u>\$ 15,046</u>	—	<u>\$ (15,046)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ —</u>	
<u>July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010</u>			
Direct costs:			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 7,809	\$ 7,809	\$ —
Total direct costs	7,809	7,809	—
Indirect costs	3,689	3,689	—
Total direct and indirect costs	11,498	11,498	—
Less offsetting savings ²	—	(27,225)	(27,225)
Subtotal	11,498	(15,727)	(27,225)
Adjustment to eliminate negative balance	—	15,727	15,727
Total program costs	<u>\$ 11,498</u>	—	<u>\$ (11,498)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ —</u>	

Attachment 1 (continued)

Cost Elements	Actual Costs Claimed	Allowable per Review	Review Adjustment ¹
<u>Summary July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2001; and July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2010</u>			
Direct costs:			
Salaries and benefits	\$ 147,279	\$ 147,279	\$ —
Materials and supplies	32,277	32,277	—
Total direct costs	179,556	179,556	—
Indirect costs	58,863	58,863	—
Total direct and indirect costs	238,419	238,419	—
Less offsetting savings	—	(171,209)	(171,209)
Subtotal	238,419	67,210	(171,209)
Adjustment to eliminate negative balance	—	31,574	31,574
Total program costs	<u>\$ 238,419</u>	98,784	<u>\$ (139,635)</u>
Less amount paid by the State		—	
Allowable costs claimed in excess of (less than) amount paid		<u>\$ 98,784</u>	

¹ See Attachment 3, Finding and Recommendation.

² See Attachment 2, Summary of Offsetting Savings Calculations.

Attachment 2— Summary of Offsetting Savings Calculations July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2001; and July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2010

Cost Elements	Offsetting Savings Reported	Offsetting Savings Realized			Review Adjustment ¹
		July - December	January - June	Total	
<u>July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2000</u>					
Maximum allowable diversion percentage		—	25.00%		
Actual diversion percentage	÷	—	÷ 33.39%		
Allocated diversion percentage		—	74.87%		
Tonnage diverted	x	—	x (146.10)		
Statewide average landfill fee per ton	x	—	x \$36.39		
Total offsetting savings, FY 1999-2000	\$ —	\$ —	\$ (3,981)	\$ (3,981)	\$ (3,981)
<u>July 1, 2000, through June 30, 2001</u>					
Maximum allowable diversion percentage		25.00%	25.00%		
Actual diversion percentage	÷	33.39%	÷ 28.62%		
Allocated diversion percentage		74.87%	87.35%		
Tonnage diverted	x	(146.10)	x (102.85)		
Statewide average landfill fee per ton	x	\$36.39	x \$36.39		
Total offsetting savings, FY 2000-01	\$ —	\$ (3,981)	\$ (3,269)	\$ (7,250)	\$ (7,250)
<u>July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004</u>					
Maximum allowable diversion percentage		50.00%	50.00%		
Actual diversion percentage	÷	45.59%	÷ 53.98%		
Allocated diversion percentage ²		100.00%	92.63%		
Tonnage diverted	x	(204)	x (269.25)		
Statewide average landfill fee per ton	x	\$36.83	x \$38.42		
Total offsetting savings, FY 2003-04	\$ —	\$ (7,513)	\$ (9,582)	\$ (17,095)	\$ (17,095)
<u>July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005</u>					
Maximum allowable diversion percentage		50.00%	50.00%		
Actual diversion percentage	÷	53.98%	÷ 55.26%		
Allocated diversion percentage		92.63%	90.48%		
Tonnage diverted	x	(269.25)	x (284.85)		
Statewide average landfill fee per ton	x	\$38.42	x \$39.00		
Total offsetting savings, FY 2004-05	\$ —	\$ (9,582)	\$ (10,052)	\$ (19,634)	\$ (19,634)
<u>July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006</u>					
Maximum allowable diversion percentage		50.00%	50.00%		
Actual diversion percentage	÷	55.26%	÷ 55.91%		
Allocated diversion percentage		90.48%	89.43%		
Tonnage diverted	x	(284.85)	x (290.70)		
Statewide average landfill fee per ton	x	\$39.00	x \$46.00		
Total offsetting savings, FY 2005-06	\$ —	\$ (10,052)	\$ (11,959)	\$ (22,011)	\$ (22,011)

Attachment 2 (continued)

Cost Elements	Offsetting Savings Reported	Offsetting Savings Realized			Review Adjustment ¹
		July - December	January - June	Total	
<u>July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007</u>					
Maximum allowable diversion percentage		50.00%	50.00%		
Actual diversion percentage		÷ 55.91%	÷ 60.27%		
Allocated diversion percentage		89.43%	82.96%		
Tonnage diverted	x	(290.70)	x (295.65)		
Statewide average landfill fee per ton	x	\$46.00	x \$48.00		
Total offsetting savings, FY 2006-07	\$ —	\$ (11,959)	\$ (11,773)	\$ (23,732)	\$ (23,732)
<u>July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008</u>					
Maximum allowable diversion percentage		50.00%	50.00%		
Actual diversion percentage		÷ 60.27%	÷ 60.27%		
Allocated diversion percentage		82.96%	82.96%		
Tonnage diverted	x	(295.65)	x (295.65)		
Statewide average landfill fee per ton	x	\$48.00	x \$51.00		
Total offsetting savings, FY 2007-08	\$ —	\$ (11,773)	\$ (12,509)	\$ (24,282)	\$ (24,282)
<u>July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009</u>					
Maximum allowable diversion percentage		50.00%	50.00%		
Actual diversion percentage		÷ 60.27%	÷ 60.27%		
Allocated diversion percentage		82.96%	82.96%		
Tonnage diverted	x	(295.65)	x (295.65)		
Statewide average landfill fee per ton	x	\$51.00	x \$55.00		
Total offsetting savings, FY 2008-09	\$ —	\$ (12,509)	\$ (13,490)	\$ (25,999)	\$ (25,999)
<u>July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010</u>					
Maximum allowable diversion percentage		50.00%	50.00%		
Actual diversion percentage		÷ 60.27%	÷ 60.27%		
Allocated diversion percentage		82.96%	82.96%		
Tonnage diverted	x	(295.65)	x (295.65)		
Statewide average landfill fee per ton	x	\$55.00	x \$56.00		
Total offsetting savings, FY 2009-10	\$ —	\$ (13,490)	\$ (13,735)	\$ (27,225)	\$ (27,225)
<u>Total offsetting savings, July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2001; and July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2010</u>					
	\$ —	\$ (80,859)	\$ (90,350)	\$ (171,209)	\$ (171,209)

¹ See Attachment 2, Finding and Recommendation.

² Sierra College did not achieve the maximum allowable diversion percentage in calendar year 2003. Therefore, 100% of the tonnage diverted is offsetting savings realized by the district.

Attachment 3— Finding and Recommendation July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2001; and July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2010

FINDING— Unreported offsetting savings

The district did not report any offsetting savings on its mandated cost claims for the review period. We determined that the district realized savings of \$171,209 from implementation of its integrated waste management (IWM) plan.

The following table summarizes the unreported offsetting savings by fiscal year:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Offsetting Savings Reported</u>	<u>Offsetting Savings Realized</u>	<u>Review Adjustment</u>
1999-2000	\$ -	\$ (3,981)	\$ (3,981)
2000-01	-	(7,250)	(7,250)
2003-04	-	(17,095)	(17,095)
2004-05	-	(19,634)	(19,634)
2005-06	-	(22,011)	(22,011)
2006-07	-	(23,732)	(23,732)
2007-08	-	(24,282)	(24,282)
2008-09	-	(25,999)	(25,999)
2009-10	-	(27,225)	(27,225)
Total	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ (171,209)</u>	<u>\$ (171,209)</u>

On March 25, 2004, the Commission on State Mandates (CSM) adopted the statement of decision for the IWM Program. The CSM determined that Chapter 1116, Statutes of 1992; and Chapter 764, Statutes of 1999, imposed upon community college districts a state mandate reimbursable under Government Code section 17561, commencing July 1, 1999.

The program's parameters and guidelines establish the state mandate and define the reimbursement criteria. The CSM adopted the parameters and guidelines on March 30, 2005.

In March 2007, the Department of Finance and the IWM Board filed a petition for writ of mandate requesting the CSM to issue new parameters and guidelines that give full consideration to the community colleges' cost savings (e.g. avoided landfill disposal fees) and revenues (from recyclables) by complying with the test claim statutes. The Judgment and a Writ of Mandate were issued on June 30, 2008, ordering the CSM to amend the parameters and guidelines to require community college districts to identify and offset from their claims, cost savings realized as a result of implementing their plan.

On September 26, 2008, the CSM amended the parameters and guidelines to the original period of reimbursement because the court's decision interprets the test claim statutes as a question of law.

In compliance with Government Code section 17558, the State Controller's Office issues claiming instructions to assist community college districts in claiming mandated-program reimbursable costs.

The amended parameters and guidelines (section VIII – Offsetting Cost Savings) state:

Reduced or avoided costs realized from implementation of the community college districts' Integrated Waste Management Plan shall be identified and offset from this claim as cost savings, consistent with the direction for revenue in Public Contract Code sections 12167 and 12167.1.

Public Contract Code sections 12167 and 12167.1 require agencies in state-owned and state-leased buildings to deposit all revenues from the sale of recyclables into the IWM Account in the IWM Fund, which are continuously appropriated to the Board for the purposes of offsetting recycling program costs. For the review period, the district did not deposit any revenue into the IWM Account in the IWM Fund. We have determined that the district had reduced or avoided costs realized from implementation of its IWM plan that it did not identify and offset from its claims as cost savings.

Offsetting Savings Calculations

The CSM's Final Staff Analysis of the proposed amendments to the parameters and guidelines (Item #8–CSM hearing of September 26, 2008) states:

...cost savings may be calculated from the annual solid waste disposal reduction or diversion rates that community colleges must annually report to the Board pursuant to Public Resources Code section 42926, subdivision (b) (1).

To compute the savings amount, we multiplied the allocated diversion percentage by the tonnage diverted, and by the avoided landfill disposal fee, as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcccl}
 & \text{Allocated Diversion \%} & & & \\
 & \begin{array}{c} \text{Maximum} \\ \text{Allowable} \end{array} & & & \text{Avoided} \\
 & & & & \text{Landfill} \\
 \text{Offsetting} & = \frac{\text{Diversion \%}}{\text{Actual}} & \times & \text{Tonnage} & \times \text{Disposal Fee} \\
 \text{Savings} & & & \text{Diverted} & \text{(per Ton)} \\
 \text{Realized} & \text{Diversion \%} & & &
 \end{array}$$

This calculation determines the cost that the district did not incur for solid waste disposal as a result of implementing its IWM plan. The offsetting savings calculations are presented in Attachment 2 – Summary of Offsetting Savings Calculations.

Allocated Diversion Percentage

Public Resource Code 42921 requires districts to achieve a solid waste diversion percentage of 25% beginning January 1, 2002, and a 50% diversion percentage by January 1, 2004. The parameters and guidelines state that districts will be reimbursed for all mandated costs incurred to achieve these levels, without reduction when they fall short of stated goals, but not for amounts used to exceed these state-mandated levels. Therefore, we allocated the offsetting savings to be consistent with the requirements of the mandated program.

For calendar years 2000 through 2007, we used the actual diversion percentage reported by the district to CalRecycle (formerly the IWM Board) pursuant to Public Resources Code section 42926, subdivision (b)(1).

In 2008, CalRecycle began focusing on “per-capita disposal” instead of “diversion percentage.” As a result, CalRecycle stopped requiring community college districts to report the actual amount of tonnage diverted. Consequently, the annual reports no longer identify a “diversion percentage.” Therefore, we used the 2007 diversion percentage to calculate the offsetting savings for FY 2007-08, FY 2008-09, and FY 2009-10. The district did not provide documentation supporting a different diversion percentage.

Tonnage Diverted

The tonnage diverted is solid waste that the district recycled, composted, and kept out of the landfill.

For calendar years 2000 through 2007, we used the actual tonnage diverted, as reported by the district to CalRecycle pursuant to Public Resources Code section 42926, subdivision (b)(1).

As previously noted, in 2008, CalRecycle stopped requiring community college districts to report the actual amount of tonnage diverted. Therefore, we used the tonnage diverted in 2007 to calculate the offsetting savings for FY 2007-08, FY 2008-09, and FY 2009-10. The district did not provide documentation supporting a different tonnage amount.

Avoided Landfill Disposal Fee (per Ton)

The avoided landfill disposal fee is used to calculate realized savings because the district no longer incurs a cost to dispose of the diverted tonnage at the landfill. For each fiscal year in the review period, we used the statewide average disposal fee provided by CalRecycle. The district did not provide documentation supporting a different disposal fee.

Recommendation

We recommend that the district offset all savings realized from implementation of the community college district's IWM plan.